

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10/27/99	10/27/99	LEO2021	

10/27/0524

EXAMINER

WATERLAUS, C.

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3027

AIR MAIL

DATE MAILED:

05/24/99

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. <b>09/107,072</b>	Applicant(s) <b>Wu et al.</b>
	Examiner <b>Clifford B. Vaterlaus</b>	Group Art Unit <b>3627</b>

Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.

This action is **FINAL**.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

#### Disposition of Claims

Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.

Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

The drawing(s) filed on Jun 29, 1998 is/are objected to by the Examiner.

The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is  approved  disapproved.

The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

All  Some\*  None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

received.

received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.

received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

#### Attachment(s)

Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

Interview Summary, PTO-413

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 3627

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

1. The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A(1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

### ***Drawings***

2. The drawings are objected to because reference numeral "136" is missing from the lead line in fig. 4B, and line 5B-5B is missing from fig. 4B as discussed on page 4, line 7.  
Correction is required.

### ***Specification***

3. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 250 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 250 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

Art Unit: 3627

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

4. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it uses legal phraseology. Also, "a mechanically actuated airtight device comprises" is repeated in the first two lines. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

5. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

Page 4, line 14, replace "Fig." with --Figs--;

Page 4, line 14 before "figures" insert --the--;

Page 6, line 22, replace "135" with --137--;

Page 7, line 6, replace "135" with --137--.

Appropriate correction is required.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitations "a cover having an upper face and a lower face" and "at least one linked plate having an upper face and a lower face." Claim 1 refers to "said lower face"

Art Unit: 3627

in line 7, and "said upper face" in line 8. The claim is not clear which lower and upper face is referred to. Similarly, Claim 2 adds a bottom having an upper face and a lower face. Claim 2 refers to "said upper face" in line 3 which could be one of three different upper faces.

8. Claim 3 recites the limitation "said upper face of said sealing gasket" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat.

No. 5,743,424 to Murata et al. in view of U.S. Pat. No. 1,273,625 to Lane.

Murata discloses a mechanically actuated airtight device comprising a cover (9A) with at least one hole (35) therethrough, a sealing gasket (40) with a base (44) forming a through opening. Murata discloses a linked plate (22) and a driving wheel (21). Murata discloses a bottom (9B) under the driving wheel and engaged with the cover. The Gasket has a rim (41) in the upper face.

Murata does not disclose a protuberance on the link plate and a guiding groove on the driving wheel, rather Murata discloses the protuberance (25) on the driving wheel and the groove

Art Unit: 3627

(22) on the link plate. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to reverse the location of the protuberance and guiding groove, since it has been held that a mere reversal of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Einstein*, 8 USPQ 167.

Murata does not disclose a wedged ramp on the base of the gasket and a wedged ramp on the linked plate, the wedged ramps mating with equal slopes. Lane discloses mating wedged ramps (5, 7) with equal slopes (see fig. 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use wedged ramps as taught by Lane with the device of Murata, to convert the horizontal motion of the linked plate into vertical motion. The use of wedged ramps as disclosed by Lane is a well known method of converting horizontal motion into vertical motion. Murata discloses that optional methods for converting horizontal motion to vertical motion can be used (col. 7, lines 33-36).

Murata and Lane do not disclose that one of the edge ramps is made of elastomeric material. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make one of the edge ramps of elastomeric material, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

Art Unit: 3627

***Conclusion***

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cliff Vaterlaus whose telephone number is (703)306-9177. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven Meyers, can be reached at (703) 308-3868.

Submission of your response by facsimile transmission is encouraged. Group 3620's facsimile number is **(703) 305-3597**. Recognizing the fact that reducing cycle time in the processing and examination of patent applications will effectively increase a patent's term, it is to your benefit to submit responses by facsimile transmission whenever permissible. Such submission will place the response directly in our examining group's hands and will eliminate Post Office processing and delivery time as well as the PTO's mail room processing and delivery time. For a complete list of correspondence not permitted by facsimile transmission, see MPEP 502.01. In general, most responses and/or amendments not requiring a fee, as well as those requiring a fee but charging such fee to a deposit account, can be submitted by facsimile transmission. Responses requiring a fee which applicant is paying by check should not be submitted by facsimile transmission separately from the check.

Art Unit: 3627

Responses submitted by facsimile transmission should include a Certificate of Transmission (MPEP 512). The following is an example of the format the certification might take:

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office (Fax No. (703) 305-3597) on       (Date)

(Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate)

(Signature)

If your response is submitted by facsimile transmission, you are hereby reminded that the original should be retained as evidence of authenticity (37 CFR 1.4 and MPEP 502.02). Please do not separately mail the original or another copy unless required by the Patent and Trademark Office. Submission of the original response or a follow-up copy of the response after your response has been transmitted by facsimile will only cause further unnecessary delays in the processing of your application; duplicate responses where fees are charged to a deposit account may result in those fees being charged twice.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be directed to steven.meyers@uspto.gov.

Art Unit: 3627

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature relating to the status of this application should be directed to the group receptionist at (703) 308-2168.

Cliff Vaterlaus  
May 20, 1999



Steven Meyers  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Group 3600